

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 9, 2007. Claims 1, 5 and 20 to 35 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 23, 25 and 30 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, 20 to 22 to 25 and 29 to 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Published Appln. No. 2003/0085942 (Narusawa) in view of U.S. Published Appln. No. 2003/0142325 (Leslie). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a print system, in which a printer and a host computer, each of which includes a communication interface for transmitting and receiving information in real time, are connected to each other to communicate with each other. The printer includes a read-out unit for reading out image data from a recording medium for recording the image data; an operation panel for receiving an instruction from a user; an operation panel controller for, in response to receiving the instruction with the operation panel, generating print setting information notifying the host computer of an interruption event, and to transmit the print setting information; a transmission unit for transmitting the image data which is read out by the read-out unit; and a printer engine for performing printing. The host computer includes receiving means for receiving the print setting information and the image data from the printer; an interruption controller for detecting the interruption event notified by the printer; and display control means for causing a display apparatus to effect a print preview display by applying the received print setting information to the received image data, in response to detecting the interruption event by the interruption controller.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, namely Narusawa and Leslie, considered either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of the print systems of Claim 1 and 23. In particular, the cited references, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least the features of a printer and a host computer connected to each other and arranged so that the printer reads out image data from a recording medium to transmit the read-out image data to the host computer, which is arranged to receive the image data read out by the printer to effect print preview display on the basis of the received image data. In addition, new dependent Claims 32 and 33 further feature that the print system is arranged so that, in a case where the host computer effects the print preview display, the host computer generates print data and the printer receives the print data generated by the host computer and print the received print data, and in a case where the host computer does not effect the print preview display, the printer generates print data and print the generated print data.

In contrast, Narusawa discloses that a printer itself can set a print condition. Narusawa further discloses that when a memory card is loaded into the printer, an interrupt is generated for the CPU of the printer so that a print condition can be set by the CPU. However, Narusawa is entirely silent in regard to an apparatus external to the printer (for example, the host computer of the present invention) generating a print preview display in accordance with the print condition set by the printer and the image data read out by the printer.

Furthermore, Narusawa also does not disclose or suggest that the printer is arranged to transmit an interrupt event to the external apparatus in accordance with a change of the print condition. However, the Office Action contends that it would be obvious to a person skilled in the art to modify a printer and external apparatus to notify the external apparatus of the interruption event itself. Even if this were true, which Applicant does not concede to be the case,

such a modification would result in a system where the external apparatus is notified of the loading of the memory card and not that the external apparatus generates a print preview display of the image data read out by the printer in response to a notification (as in Claim 1) or an interrupt (as featured in Claim 23).

Finally, Leslie discloses that a PC obtains information such as the print condition from the printer, thereby effecting the print preview display on the PC side. However, in Leslie, a user operates the PC to effect the print preview display (for example, setting a print condition and transmitting it to the printer), and in addition, it should be noted that image data to be previewed is generated on the PC side. (See Leslie, paragraph [0022]). Therefore, Leslie fails to disclose that the printer is arranged to read out the image data to transmit it to the PC, which is arranged to effect print preview display of the received image data, and is also arranged to set and change the print condition by itself. Thus, Leslie does not disclose or suggest that the external apparatus is arranged to effect print preview display of the image data read out by the printer and thus also does not disclose or suggest causing the external apparatus to effect the print preview display of the image data read out by the printer, in accordance with change of the print condition, caused by the printer.

In light of the deficiencies of Narusawa and Leslie as discussed above, Applicants submit that amended independent Claims 1 and 23 are now in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

Amended independent Claims 25 and 30 are directed to methods substantially in accordance with the systems of Claims 1 and 23, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 25 and 30 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully request same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

No claim fees are believed due; however, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 50-3939.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/
Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicant

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1897745v1